

Attached to this statement are copies of articles reviewing Maryland's unfortunate experience with legalized lotteries, general historical experience, and England's second thoughts.

Is it worth risking Maryland's good name and the erosion of its public standards by legalizing a source of tax revenue, which both historical and current examples show is illusory?

I am asking this Committee to recognize that lotteries do not create wealth. In the last analysis, government must be supported by constructive and creative labor. Taxation must rest upon this base — with the full knowledge and acceptance of the cost of government by the people of Maryland. Games of chance merely hide this fact and they should be barred by constitutional mandate.

I would like to supplement this statement by saying that you will find the gambling authorizations in those states which are tourist meccas. They do this to feed upon the visitors and to avoid paying honest taxes themselves. You will find this in Nevada and this is the motivation in New Hampshire. England is motivated by the same policy and I think you will find this also in the Virgin Islands. Now, there has been talk about the great sport of horse racing that has been traditional in Maryland. The real object of pari-mutuel betting is to permit horse racing to survive. The amount of revenue that Maryland enjoys from horse racing is inconsequential. It is relatively nothing. So to compare the great sport of horse racing — to call it a gambling operation is certainly incorrect.

Now, the result of permitting lotteries, legalizing gambling in the State of Maryland, you will find a descent of locusts and sooner or later I predict we will have open gambling in this State. As Judge Sherbow has said gamblers will come in and the life will be permeated by the gamblers' influence. In the last session of the General Assembly I believe the House passed an authorization, I believe it was a constitutional amendment to permit a lottery. If it should pass the General Assembly Maryland's good name soon will suffer the erosion that comes with open gambling.

I call your attention that the Legislative Liaison Committee is in substantial agreement that this Constitutional Committee should be continued and brought forward to the new Constitution.

I urge that this is not a frivolous or a funny matter. This is not a time for levity.

I like jokes myself and I have, you might say, a few bad habits which I would not want to relate here, but I want to say to you that it is not a time for laughter because Maryland's good name and Maryland's future is at stake in this vote.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Dukes.

DELEGATE DUKES: I will call on a conservative from Anne Arundel County, Delegate Weidemeyer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mr. Chairman and members of the Convention, I do not think it is time for jokes either. Neither do I want a joke in the constitution because this is what it would be as I read this language, sanctioned or authorized, it all means the same thing. When you get into sanctioned, you get into acquiescence, too. When we get into that, even if the Legislature did nothing, anyone who had a conception of what lottery would be, would be clearly authorized to go into any port, in any county in this State and drag in any church or any club or organization that had any kind of a game of chance on his theory that it was lottery and ask that they be enjoined from violating the intent and spirit of the constitution and as has been explained by the Committee Chairman. This provision is broad and intended to be broad and it is intended to embrace a state lottery and any kind of a gambling lottery that might be conducted by any private individual or club or organization. It also has been explained by the Chairman, that it would be a good bit on what the court said a lottery was or the attorney general's opinion, so that we might say without having it written in here that the State nor any of its subdivisions shall sanction any lottery in any form except as provided by ruling of the court or by opinion of the attorney general. Now, rather than have that in our Constitution, so that we are in an uncertain area, we are better off leaving it entirely out of the constitution and then let the legislature in its discretion legislate in that area of what is and what is not and what is and what should not be. If we keep our provisions of referendum in the constitution, then if the people in the State of Maryland are dissatisfied with any action of the state legislature, they can at any time go in and take it out on referendum and then we will have the voice of the people.

I introduced a proposal here which was before the Committee. It did provide in de-